

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 195

TM 005 924

AUTHOR Millard, Joseph E.
 TITLE Teacher Evaluation.
 INSTITUTION Heartland Education Agency, Ankeny, Iowa.
 PUB DATE Sep 76
 NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; Effective Teaching;
 *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation;
 *Measurement Techniques; Self Evaluation; Summative
 Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS Flanders Interaction Analysis; Guided Self Analysis
 System; Individually Guided Education; Instrument for
 Observation of Teaching Activities; IOTA; Naperville
 Teacher Performance Evaluation System; Plan for
 Learning in Accordance with Needs; Redfern Approach;
 School Management Institute Materials; Teacher Self
 Appraisal System

ABSTRACT

Teachers may be evaluated (1) according to their skills and attitudes, (2) by observing their behavior, (3) observing the students' behavior and achievement, and (4) by a combination of means. Some systems, summative and formative, now enjoying rather wide popularity are described in this document. IOTA (Instrument for Observation of Teaching Activities) places the responsibility for evaluation in the hands of the teacher; it is strictly a formative system geared for the improvement of instruction. The Naperville Teacher Performance Evaluation System has provided a model for schools wishing to conduct their own procedure. This system is a formative evaluation process to improve instruction. School Management Institute Materials (The Redfern Approach) may be helpful if a school is interested in conducting its own inservice teacher evaluation workshop and developing its own evaluation system. Three self-appraisal systems considered are the Guided Self Analysis (GSA), Teacher Self Appraisal (TSA), and Flander's Interaction Analysis. The GSA and TSA make use of videotaping the classroom and the Flander's system utilizes an observer in the classroom. Two observation systems generally intended for formative evaluation only are the IGE (Individually Guided Education) observation cycle and PLAN (Plan for Learning in Accordance with Needs) teacher observation scale. The schemes presented may provide a starting point for school districts interested in developing their own system. (RC)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

Teacher Evaluation

Fattu:

1. In general there appears to be only a slight relationship between intelligence and rated success of an instructor.
2. A Common misconception is that knowledge of subject matter is a major factor in teaching performance. Except for occasional studies in mathematics, chemistry and physics, research findings report little relationship.¹

it appears that a teacher's rated effectiveness at first increases rapidly with experience and then levels off at five years or beyond.

Fattu:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

4. No particular differences have been shown when the relative effectiveness of men and women teachers has been compared.¹

6. In most of the studies of unsuccessful teachers, it has been found that poor maintenance of discipline and lack of cooperation tend to be the chief causes of failure. Health, educational background, preparation, age, and knowledge of subject matter, on the other hand appear to be relatively unimportant factors in terms of teacher failure.¹

5. There appears to be no evidence that married teachers are in any way inferior to single teachers.¹

Teacher Evaluation

Prepared by

Joseph E. Millard, Ph.D., Director of
Research and Evaluation

Educational Services Division

**Heartland Education Agency (AEA 11)
1932 S. W. 3rd Street
Ankeny, Iowa 50021**

September, 1976

Teacher Evaluation

Mirror, mirror, on the wall, who's the fairest of them all? In reviewing the literature on teacher evaluation it soon becomes evident there exists no single instrument for evaluating teacher effectiveness. On occasion it appears the magic mirror is close to being discovered, only to find that it is biased in one direction or another.

A method for evaluating teachers is difficult to find because there exists so many factors in teaching. A good teacher is a combination of many faces.

Teachers may be evaluated: 1. according to their skills and attitudes, 2. by observing their behavior, 3. by observing the students behavior and achievement, and 4. by a combination of means.

First, teachers may be evaluated according to the skills they possess, the attitudes they hold, or the knowledge they acquire. Biddle classifies these characteristics as teacher properties in Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. In evaluating teacher properties it is assumed that the various abilities are "within" the teacher and can not be directly observed. Tests are devised to measure these hidden talents, but the failure to develop instruments which accurately measure empathy, intelligence, etc. has resulted in little use of evaluating teachers by this method.

Secondly, teachers may be evaluated according to their behavior. A teacher's behavior may be observed and evaluated by many people. Instruments have been designed for students to use in observing their teachers, for administrators to use, for other teachers to use, and for parents to use in observing teacher behavior. Two of the more recent techniques used in observing teacher behavior is that of using an audio or audio visual recording of the teacher performance. The taped performance is then evaluated either by the teacher or other professionally trained persons.

Since there are literally hundreds of variables which an observer can be looking for in a teacher's behavior, hundreds of instruments have been designed. The many teacher rating scales are evident of this. Educators have not agreed on specific behavior which they believe reflects good teaching. Thus, the observational methods do not always identify the effective teacher.

A third method of evaluating teacher effectiveness is to examine the pupil's performance. The most common approach in measuring teacher effectiveness by using this technique is to test student achievement. If the

pupil shows academic growth, it is concluded that this is a result of effective teaching. Unfortunately this is not always the case. Home environment, maturation rate, economic and cultural conditions, and self concept all contribute to the achievement performance of a student. These may not be variables controlled by the teacher. Therefore, to evaluate a teacher only on pupil achievement is unrealistic.

A pupil's behavior can also be observed and the teacher evaluated according to the student's actions. Many would say this is a limited method of evaluating teacher effectiveness, while others promote it as a good procedure. Little appears in the literature concerning evaluating teachers according to pupil behavior, but many writers do state that teachers are fired because of poor discipline in their classroom. Therefore, it appears that the pupil behavior is sometimes interpreted as reflecting teacher effectiveness.

In the past decade a number of teacher evaluation techniques have been developed to better gauge the performance, find the trouble spots, identify merit or dead weight. In that decade much has been done to encourage more objective evaluation; to move the responsibility for evaluation from the subjective and sometimes arbitrarily judgement of a single individual to a more broadly based set of values and styles of operation. The basic notions remain the same, the tactics have been changed.

From the beginning one must know what he wants of his chosen technique. It is exceedingly important that the purpose of the evaluation be in harmony with the intent of the evaluation system. Should a formative or summative evaluation be emphasized?

The formative evaluation stresses the teaching learning process. Emphasis here is placed on the improvement of instruction by way of data gained from observation of classroom activities. The information gained is shared with the classroom teacher and weaknesses are identified and strengths stroked. The teacher is in on the process from the beginning.

The summative system, by contrast, gives feedback at the completion of the evaluation process. Summative systems are used primarily as a pass-fail report card. Its results mean either retention or release. A decision in favor of either a formative or summative approach must first be made.

In either case, however, and for each of the systems reported below it is important that planning be a cooperative venture among teachers and administrators with help from specialists, consultants, parents and students.

Not only must procedure be tailored to the situation found in a local district or building, but as well the values of the particular community, neighborhood, and staff must clearly be defined in terms of what is wanted from the schools. It follows then that the purpose of the evaluation -- formative or summative -- and the reasons behind that decision are understood by everyone involved. A common ground for communication is always necessary.

Some systems now enjoying rather wide popularity are described below. The relative merits of each are matters for the reader to decide.

IOTA (Instrument For The Observation of Teaching Activities)

This evaluation procedure places the responsibility for evaluation in the hands of the teacher. It is a formative system stressing self evaluation and improvement through personal perception. The underlying philosophy of IOTA is that it is possible to improve instruction, it is essential that teachers do improve and that teachers do desire to improve their teaching competence. The teacher identifies a teacher's present level of competence and provides a basis for selection of skills to be strengthened.

Observation and data collection are guided by an implementation manual. The observation team and the observed teacher reconcile their rating based on an observation scale. Next, a profile is prepared showing the identified areas of competence and weakness. The teachers are asked if they are willing to share their experiences with co-workers, a file of such information is built so that teachers may be referred to their own colleagues for help through conferences or visitation. The teacher and the team may then identify areas needing improvement or the teacher may opt not to set any goals. When areas are identified, they become targets for improvement before the next observation. Following the conferences all data sheets are destroyed except those which the teacher chooses for reference.

While the observation instrument is based upon a scientifically designed set of standards, the system is adaptable to local school philosophy. Since this evaluation system is not used for rating merit, it is strictly a formative system geared for the improvement of instruction.

Naperville Teacher Performance Evaluation System

A teacher evaluation system developed in Naperville, Illinois, working jointly with Dr. Richard Manatt, professor at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, has provided a model for schools wishing to conduct their own procedure. This system is a formative evaluation process to improve instruction and is based on the following premises:

1. A school community has a right to expect that the school board, administrators, and faculty of their district will conduct a valid and continuous evaluation of the services of all district employees.
2. The essential purpose of evaluation is the improvement of performance.
3. The professional teacher desires improvement.
4. It is possible to differentiate levels of performance.
5. All evaluation of teacher activities should be conducted openly and with the teacher's full knowledge and awareness.
6. The school must respect the uniqueness of each individual within the framework of the school.
7. Multiple sources of evaluation increase the validity of an evaluation instrument.

The Naperville model examines the teacher's relationship with students, co-workers and the school community in term of desired teachers characteristics. The characteristics are different from school system to school system and from community to community.

The Naperville model has several major operational components. The first component is the selection of the evaluation team. Principals, assistant principals, department heads, and classroom teachers function as team members. Self evaluation is required and it is useful in having teachers set self improvement goals.

The second component is the training of evaluators. Pre-evaluation conferences, observation visits, post-visit conferences, evaluation reports, and due process procedures are additional components in this system.

This system is formative in nature but the due process procedure suggest that the information is also used as a summative evaluation. The West Des Moines Community Schools in West Des Moines, Iowa, has developed a similar system.

School Management Institute Materials (The Redfern Approach)

If a school is interested in conducting its own inservice teacher evaluation workshop and developing its own evaluation system, materials from the School Management Institute may be helpful. This system was developed by Dr. George B. Redfern. The media prepared for the system consist of:

1. A ten minute sound film, Successful Teacher Evaluation.
2. A set of three filmstrips and long playing records, Evaluating Teacher Performance.
3. A 60 minute tape cassette, Critical Incidents in Teacher Evaluation.
4. Two books, A Teacher's Guide to Teaching Performance Evaluation by Harold R. Armstrong and How To Evaluate Teaching A Performance Objective Approach by George B. Redfern.

This system is a performance objective approach and emphasizes the summative aspect of teacher evaluation and the supervisor's role in the evaluation process. The procedure requires that the teachers clearly knows what is expected of them in terms of performance results. Knowing what performance is expected of the teacher can then be evaluated in terms of those objectives. It clearly shows some aspect of MBO (Management by Objectives). The model used in the SMI approach consist of six basic components:

1. Performance criteria - the duties and the responsibilities required in the performance of an assignment must be specified.
2. Performance objectives - appropriate performance objectives or targets are developed.
3. Performance activities - instructional procedures are employed to meet the objectives.
4. Monitoring performance - the evaluator monitors the teaching to collect data which relates to the objectives which are being pursued.
5. Assessing monitored data - persons involved in evaluation interpret the meaning and significance of the monitored data.
6. Conference and follow up - feedback is given to the teacher and assistance is given to help the teacher improve.

Self Appraisal Systems

Two widely used teacher self appraisal systems are the guided self-analysis (GSA) developed by Dr. Theodore Parsons from the University of California and Teacher Self Appraisal (TSA) system developed by the EPIC Diversified Systems Corporation, Tucson, Arizona.

The GSA is a systemized program designed to assist a teacher in the analysis of questioning techniques. The program has the potential of giving a teacher feedback regarding verbal behavior in the classroom and clues for eliciting more in-dept student thought processes. Video taping is used in this process. The tapes are then coded according to various teacher-student interactions.

7

TSA also makes use of video taping the classroom. This is a more comprehensive system since it focuses on teacher methods, objectives, verbal and non-verbal expressions in the classroom. The observation results from this system can be utilized to assess instructional effectiveness and improving instruction in the classroom. Persons using the TSA system are trained to utilize the procedure in a workshop conducted by the EPIC Diversified Systems Corporation.

Flander's Interaction Analysis is a third self appraisal system, which uses an observer in the classroom. The trained observer records data by noting code symbols at set time intervals. Classroom communication patterns can be defined and teacher student interaction can be studied. The classroom interaction analysis provides information, which the teacher may use to change teaching behavior.

Observation Systems

These processes are generally intended for formative evaluation only. Two commonly used systems are the IGE (Individually Guided Education) observation cycle and PLAN (Plan for Learning in Accordance with Needs) teacher observation scale. Guidelines for developing the PLAN observation scale are explained by Thomas J. Quirk in January 1971, Journal of Educational Psychology, "Development of the Program for Learning in Accordance with Needs Teacher Observation Scale". Seventeen categories of the instrument are defined in this article.

The IGE Observation Cycle is also a teacher observation system. It provides for planning sessions, the development of observation team procedures for determining objectives to be observed and feedback provisions to the observed teacher. Neither of these are complete teacher observation systems, but they may provide meaningful preliminary information in developing an evaluation procedure.

The following information from PREP #21 (Putting Research Into Educational Practice) published by the U.S. Office of Education offers several suggestions concerning the development of a measurement instrument.

"Selecting an adequate and competent measuring instrument is crucial in the evaluation process and the following should be considered:

1. Its relevance and validity - does it measure what it is intended to measure?
2. Its reliability - does it continue to maintain its stability from one application to another?

3. Its validity - does the response to the instrument parallel in the actual performance?
4. Its ease of administration and scoring - how much time is needed to administer the instrument? Is it easily scored or interpreted?
5. Its cost - is it practical and worth the cost?
6. Its "taboo" factor - does it conflict with local customs or tradition?

Problems are encountered in teacher evaluation when there is an emphasis on fault-finding rather than on helping teachers; when prejudice, bias, and poor judgement are used in collecting and analyzing information; and when communication is not open and honest." (PREP #21)

There are numerous teacher rating scales and individual school evaluation procedures. This article discusses a few different and basic types of teacher evaluation schemes now being used. These schemes should not be considered as the best teacher evaluation systems, but they may provide a starting point for school districts interested in developing their own system. If a school district is developing an effective and appropriate evaluation system a few basic questions ought to be considered. Ask yourself:

What information are you after; what do you want to evaluate? Are you thinking in terms of objectives, targets, methods, behavior, etc.? And as you go about it, is the object of evaluation clear to all parties? Have you communicated your desires effectively?

Who is going to evaluate? Decide who the observer will be before the evaluation system is implemented.

How are you going to do it? Will you have a regular scheme of observation, whether by audio tape, video tape, or by visitation? Will there be a pre-conference and post-conference? When and for how long will the evaluation's procedure continue?

And, finally (maybe firstly), why are you doing all of this anyway? Why are you evaluating?

- Bradley, R. and others. A design for teacher evaluation. The National Elementary Principal, November 1963, 43, 32-37.
- Bradley, R. and others. Instrument for the observation of teaching activities, (IOTA). The Role of the Teacher in Society. Tempe, Arizona: National QIOTA Council, 1971.
- Brighton, S. and Rose, G. Increasing your accuracy in teacher evaluation. Successful School Management Series, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bruett, M. and Carey, R.L. Prepackaged abstracts on Teacher Evaluation, INFORMS, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA, 1973.
- Busch, R.N., and Allen, D.W. Micro-teaching. Paper presented at the Ford Foundation Conference on Teacher Education, Santa Barbara, California, 1964.
- Calabria, F.M. Characteristics of effective teachers. Educational Research Bulletin, 1960, 39, 92-100
- Callanan, J.A., (Ed.) Evaluating your teachers, Croft Leadership Action Folio 5, Croft Educational Services, Inc., 1970.
- Carey, R.L., and Bruett, M. Teacher Evaluation. Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, 1973.
- Cassel, R.N., and Johns, W.L. The critical characteristics of an effective teacher. NASSP Bulletin, 1960, 44, 119-124.
- Casterter, W.B. Administering the school personnel program, New York, New York: Macmillan, 227-301, 1962.
- Cook, W.W., Leads, C.H. and Callis, R. Minnesota teacher attitude inventory, New York, New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.
- Cornell, T.D. A manual for utilizing the interaction analysis observation system. Tucson, Arizona: Educational Innovators Press, 1973.
- Cornell, T.D. Educational accountability: A format for monitoring the teaching learning process. Tucson, Arizona: Educational Innovators Press, 1970.
- Davidoff, S.H. The development of an instrument designed to secure student assessment of teaching behaviors that correlate with objective measures of student achievement. ERIC No. ED 039 170, March 1970.
- Deever, M.R., Demeke, H.J. Wochner, R.E. The evaluation of teaching competence. Workshop Manual for IOTA National IOTA Program, Tempe, Arizona.
- DeVaughn, E.J. A manual for developing resonable, objective, nondiscriminatory standards for evaluating teacher performance, September 1971. (ERIC No. ED 059 151)
- Downey, L.W. The task of public education: The perception of people. Studies in educational administration, No. 7, Chicago, Illinois: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

- Alkin, M.C. and Klein, S.P. Accountability defined. Evaluating teachers for outcome accountability. Los Angeles, California, University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068495)
- Allen, P.M., and others. Teacher Self Appraisal. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.
- Almy, H.C. and Sorenson, H. Almy-Sorenson rating scale for teachers. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company.
- Amidon, E. and Hunter, E. Improving teaching: An analysis of classroom verbal interaction. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Anderson, J.P. Student perceptions of teacher influence. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Andrews, J.H.M. and Brown, A.F. Can principals exclude their own personality characteristics when they rate their teachers? Educational Administration and Supervision, 1959, 45, 234-242.
- Anthony, B.M. A new approach to the merit rating of teachers. In Administrator's Handbook, 1968, 7, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago.
- Armstrong, H.R. A teacher's guide to teaching performance evaluation. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute Inc., 6800 High Street, 1972.
- Aschner, M.J. The analysis of classroom discourse: A method and its uses. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1958.
- Bail, F.T., & Dunn-Rankin, P. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Educational Perspectives, May 1972, 26-32.
- Barr, A.S., and Jones, R.E. The measurement and prediction for teaching efficiency. Review of Educational Research, 1958, 28, 256-264.
- Barr, A.S., and others. Wisconsin studies of the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness: A summary of investigations. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications, Inc., 1961.
- Beller, E.K. Teacher evaluation: Why, what and how. Peabody Journal of Education, January 1971, 48, No.2, 125-139.
- Biber, B. Problems of values and measures in evaluation of teaching. Educational Leadership, 1958, 15, 213-217.
- Biddle, B.J., and Williams, J.E. (Eds.) Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Bolton, D.L. Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Bradford, E., Doremus, A., & Kreisner, C. Elementary school evaluation: Administrator's Guide to Accountability. Parker, April 1972.

- Gowan, J.C. Self-report tests in the prediction of teaching effectiveness. School Review, 1960, 68, 409-419.
- Handbook for evaluating instruction, 1971, (ERIC NO. ED 058 556)
- Harkness, V.J. Staff participation in the recruitment, selection and assignment of teachers, Ed. Doctoral Dissertation. Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State College.
- Harrison, R.H. Supervisory leadership in education. New York, New York: American Book Company, 1968.
- Hawley, R.C. Evaluating teaching: A handbook of positive approaches. Amherst, Massachusetts: Education Research Associates, 1976.
- Herman, Hary J. Developing an effective school staff evaluation program. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Herman, W. Principal's guide to teacher personnel problems in the elementary school. Parker, 1966.
- Howsam, R.B. Teacher valuation: Facts and folklore. National Elementary Principal, November 1963, 43, 7-18.
- Howsam, R.B. Who's a good teacher? Joint Committee of California Teacher Association and California School Boards Association, Burlingame, California, 1960.
- Hoyt, D.P. Identifying effective teaching behaviors, Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1969.
- Hunter, E. Report cards for teachers. Childhood Education, May 1972.
- Hunter M. Teacher competency problem theory, and practice. Theory into Practice, April 1976, 15, No. 2.
- Instrument for the improvement of instruction for classroom teachers, (ERIC no. ED 045 602), 1969.
- Iowa State Education Association, Report of the 1971 Teacher Evaluation Conference, Iowa State Education Association, 4025 Tonawanda Drive, Des Moines, Iowa, 1971.
- Israel, J.W. Innovation in evaluation: Teacher assessment by objectives, (ERIC NO. ED 029 625), 1969.
- Johnson, C.E. and Bauch, J.P. Competency based teacher evaluation guide, GEM Bulletin 70-3, Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1970.
- Justiz, T.B. A reliable measure of teacher effectiveness. Educational Leadership, October 1969, 3 No. 1.
- Lee, D.M. Diagnostic teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, NEW Center, 1201 Sixteenth St., 1970.
- Lewis, G.M. The evaluation of teaching, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, NEA, 1966.

- Ebel, R.L. Using tests for evaluation. National Elementary Principal, 1955, 35, 29-31.
- Ellena, W.J., Stevenson, M. and Webb, H.V. Who's a good teacher? Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators and Department of Classroom Teachers of the NEA National School Boards Association, 1961.
- Evaluating school personnel. The National Elementary Principal, February 1973, 52, 5.
- Evaluating teacher effectiveness. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1971.
- Evaluating teachers for professional growth. A Publication of the National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. More St., Arlington, Virginia, 1974.
- Evaluating teaching performance. Educational Research Service, Arlington, Virginia, 1972.
- Evaluating the evaluator. Educational Research Service, Arlington, Virginia, 1973.
- Evaluation of teaching competence. NEA Research Bulletin, October 1969, 47, 67-75.
- Fattu, N.A. Research on teacher evaluation. In Selected Readings on General Supervision (Edited by Heald, James E. and others,) New York, New York: Macmillan Company, 279-291, 1970.
- Fawcett, C.W. School personnel administration. New York, New York: Macmillan, 55-56, 1964.
- Fishman, J.A. Cross-cultural perspective on the evaluation of guided behavioral change. In The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Pi Lambda Theta, 1967.
- Flanders, N.A. Teacher influence-pupil attitudes and achievement: studies in interactions analysis. Final report, Cooperative Research Project No. 397, Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Flanders, N.A., & Simon, A. Teacher effectiveness. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York, New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Flanders, N.A. Analyzing teaching behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.
- Fox, W., and Jones, R.D. Plan for evaluation of teacher efficiency through cooperative goal-setting. Clearinghouse, May 1970, 44, 9, 541-543.
- Gage, N.L. A method for improving teacher behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, September 1963a, 14, 261-266.
- Gage, N.L. (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching, Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Getzels, J.W., and Guba, E.G. The structure of roles and role conflict in the teaching situation. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1955, 29, 30-40.

- Pi Lambda Theta, The evaluation of teaching, Washington D.C., 1967.
- Popham, W.J. Designing teacher evaluation systems. Los Angeles, California: The Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1971.
- Poppleton, P. The assessment of teaching practices: What criteria do we use? Education for Teaching, Spring 1968, 75, 59-64.
- Redfern, G.B. Accountability: Echoes from the field. The National Elementary Principal, March/April 1976, 55, No. 4.
- Redfern, G.B. Evaluating teaching performance, set of three sound filmstrips, 1970, Critical incidents in teacher evaluation, tape cassett, 1972, Successful teacher evaluation, sound motion picture, 1972, all by School Management Institute, Worthington, Ohio.
- Redfern, G.B. How to appraise teaching performance. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, Inc., 6800 High Street, 1963.
- Redfern, G.B. How to evaluate teaching, a performance objectives approach. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, 6800 High Street, 1972.
- Roberson, E. W. Developing observation systems. Tucson, Arizona: Educational Innovators Press, 1970.
- Roberson, E.W. Teacher self-appraisal: A way to improve instruction. Journal of Teacher Education, Winter 1971, 22, 469-473.
- Rogge, W.M. Teacher self assessment. Chicago, Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 259 East Erie Street, 1968. (Out of print)
- Rose, G. Toward the evaluation of teaching. Educational Leadership, 1958, 15, 231-238.
- Rose, G. The effects of administrative evaluation. The National Elementary Principal, November, 1963, 43, 50-53.
- Rosenshine, B. Evaluation of classroom instruction. Review of Educational Research, April 1970, 40, 279-300.
- Ryan, D.G. Assessment of teacher behavior and instruction. Review of Educational Research, November 1963, 43, 50-53.
- Ryan, D.G. Characteristics of teachers: Their description, comparison and appraisal. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1960.
- Ryan, D.G. The investigation of teacher character. Educational Record, October 1953, 34, 371-396.
- Ryans, D.G. Teacher evaluation research Part I. Honolulu, Hawaii, University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 055 991)
- Saadek, Q. Teaching effectiveness of classroom efficiency: A new direction in evaluation of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1970, 73-89.
- Schuck, R.F. The influence of set induction upon student achievement and perception of effective teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1970, 35-40.

- McDaniel, E. The evaluation of teacher effectiveness. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 065 543)
- McDenna, B.H., and others. Teacher evaluation: An annotated bibliography. Washington D.C.: National Center for Educational Communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 055 988)
- McKette, J. Measuring teaching effectiveness. Journal of English Education, December 1969, 325.
- McNally, H. J. Teacher evaluation that makes a difference. Educational Leadership, January 1972, 29, 353-357.
- Malone, C.F. Design for productive classroom evaluation, Clearinghouse, February 1968, 42, 348-354.
- Medley, D.M., and Williams, I.F. Predicting teacher effectiveness with the Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory. Series No. 34. New York City, New York: Board of High Education Research, 1957.
- Merlino, E.S. A study of teacher behavior and attitudes based on the results of pupil feedback. Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1965.
- Millard, J.E. Teacher evaluation. Ankeny, Iowa: Polk and Story Joint County School System, 1971.
- Mitzel, H.E. A behavioral approach to the assessment of teacher effectiveness. New York: Office of Research and Evaluation, Division of Teacher Education, College of the City of New York, 1957.
- Mitzel, H.E. Teacher Effectiveness. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by C.W. Harris, New York, New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.
- Moore, W.J. and Schout, J.A. Stability of teaching behavior, responsiveness to training and teaching effectiveness. Journal of Educational Research, July/August 1976, 69, No. 10.
- Mueller, D.G. How to evaluate teaching. ERIC Clearinghouse on teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1971, 22.
- Musella, D. Improving teacher evaluation, Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1970, 21.
- Naperville Community School District 203. Teacher performance evaluation handbook, Naperville Community School District 203, Naperville, Illinois, 1973.
- N.J.E.A. speaks out on teacher evaluation, Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Educational Association, 180 W. State Street, 1970.
- Ornstein, A.C. Can we define a good teacher? Peabody Journal of Education, April 1976, 53, No. 3.
- Parsons, T.W. Guided self-analysis system for professional development education series, ERIC No. ED 052 151, Guided Self-analysis Professional Development Systems, 1971.

- Seidman, J.M., and Simpson, R.H. Student evaluation of teaching and learning. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 16th Street N.W., 1962.
- Selden, D. Evaluate teachers? AFT Quest Paper, Department of Research, American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street N.W. Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Simon, A. and Boyer, G.E. Mirrors for behavior an anthology of classroom observation instruments. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1968.
- Simpson, R.H. Teacher self-evaluation. New York, New York: Macmillan, 1966.
- Stemnock, S.K. Evaluating teaching performance. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service Circular No. 2, National Education Association, 1972.
- Stemnock, S.K. The evaluatee evaluates the evaluator. Circular No. 4, Educational Research Service, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., 1973.
- Teacher evaluative procedures. Oregon Education, October 1966, 41.
- Tumin, M.M. Evaluation of the effectiveness of education: Some problems and prospects. Interchange, 1970, 96-109.
- Turner, R.L., and Fattu, N.A. Skill in teaching: A reappraisal of the concepts and strategies in teacher effectiveness research. Bulletin of the School of Education No. 36, Indiana University, May 1960.
- U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Communication, PREP Kit No. 21, Teacher Evaluation, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.
- U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Communication, PREP Kit No. 25, Improving Teaching Effectiveness, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.
- Vander Werf, L.S. How to evaluate teachers and teaching. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960.
- Vincent, W.S. Indicators of quality: Signs of good teaching, Vincent and Olson, School Evaluation Services, Box 22, Salisbury, Connecticut, 1972.
- Vincent, W.S., and Olson, M.N. Indicators of quality: Measurement of school quality and its determiners. Vincent and Olson, School Evaluation Services, Box 22, Salisbury, Connecticut, 1972.
- Vroegh, K. Sex of teacher and academic achievement: A review of research. The Elementary School Journal, April 1976, 76, No. 7.
- Walberg, H.J. (Ed.) Evaluating educational performance. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Weir, E.C. Some thoughts on evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, December 1962, 40, 23-29.
- Wick, J.W., and Beggs, D.L. Evaluation for decision-making in the school. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.

Wilhelms, F. (Ed.) Evaluation as feedback and guide, 1967 Yearbook.
Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1967.

A Workshop in the analysis of teaching. Theory into Practice, December 1968,
7, No. 5.

Teacher Socrates

A. Personal Qualifications
1. Personal appearance

RATING
(HIGH TO LOW)

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

COMMENTS

Dresses in an old sheet draped
about his body
Not sure of himself-always
asking questions
Speaks with a heavy Greek
accent.
Prone to suicide by posion
when under duress.

2. Self-confidence

3. Use of English

4. Adaptability

B. Class Management
1. Organization

2. Room appearance

3. Utilization of supplies

C. Teacher-Pupil Relationships
1. Tact and consideration

2. Attitude of class

D. Techniques of Teaching
1. Daily preparation

2. Attention to course
of study

3. Knowledge of subject
matter

E. Professional Attitude
1. Professional ethics

2. In-service training

3. Parent relationships

1 2 3 4 (5)
1 2 3 (4) 5

(1) 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 (2) 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 (3) 4 5

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

1 2 3 4 (5)

Does not keep a seating chart
Does not have eye-catching
bulletin boards
Does not use supplies

Places student in embarrassing
situation by asking questions
Class is friendly

Does not keep daily lesson
plan
Quite flexible-allows students
to wander to different topics
Does not know material-has to
question pupils to gain
knowledge

Does not belong to
professional association, PTA
Complete failure here-has not
even bothered to attend college
Needs to improve in this area-
parents are trying to get rid
of him

Recommendation: Does not have a place in Education. Should not be rehired.